

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

STUDIO 010 INC,

Plaintiff,

v.

DIGITAL CASHFLOW LLC et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-01018-DGE

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
CORRECTION AND
CONSOLIDATED JUDGMENT
(DKT. NO. 132)

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion "for correction of the Final Report On The Filing Or Determination Of An Action Regarding A Patent Or Trademark" and "for consolidation of the orders in Dkt Nos. 116, 117, 124, and 127, into a single recordable judgment for entry and enforcement." (Dkt. No. 132.)


Plaintiff asks the Court to modify form AO 120, which was filed with the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office by the Clerk's office on May 31, 2024. (Dkt. No. 128.) The form provides a report "on the filing or determination of an action regarding a patent or trademark." (*Id.*) The form advised the Patent Office of the Court's order of October 13, 2023,

1 in which the Court granted in part and denied in part Plaintiff's motion for default judgment.
2 (*Id.*) In the form, the Clerk's office summarized the judgment issued on October 13, 2023,
3 which focused largely on the monetary damages awarded by the Court. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 117;
4 128.) Plaintiff contends the AO 120 form does not mention the Court's ruling with respect to
5 invalidity of the '191 patent and asks the Court to amend the form to highlight the Court's
6 finding. (Dkt. No. 132 at 1.) However, Plaintiff cites no authority for the proposition that the
7 Court can or should modify the AO 120 form in the manner Plaintiff suggests. To the extent
8 Plaintiff wishes to draw the Patent Office's attention to the Court's finding with respect to
9 invalidity, he may submit a copy of the Court's order.

10 Plaintiff further seeks to consolidate several of the Court's rulings into a single document
11 "to streamline the process of enforcing the judgment in one or more state or Federal courts." (*Id.*
12 at 2.) The proposed judgment submitted by Plaintiff summarizes the findings of the Court in its
13 orders on Plaintiff's motion for default judgment, Plaintiff's motion for attorney fees, and the
14 Clerk's order on Plaintiff's bill of costs. (Dkt. No. 132-2.) Plaintiff has not provided any
15 authority for the proposition that the Court can or should issue the type of "consolidated"
16 judgment Plaintiff seeks—and as of now, has not provided any evidence why the already issued
17 orders and judgment are not enforceable. To the extent Plaintiff wishes to provide a summary of
18 the Court's findings to ease enforcement, he may do so in the form of a cover letter accurately
19 describing the Court's findings. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. No. 132) is DENIED.

20 Dated this 22nd day of August, 2024.

21
22
23
24



David G. Estudillo
United States District Judge